

International Journal of Modern Physics D
© World Scientific Publishing Company

Numerically Fitting The Electron Fermi Energy and The Electron Fraction in A Neutron Star

Xing Hu, Li

1. *Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, CAS, 150, Science 1-Street, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China.*
2. *Key Laboratory of Radio Astronomy, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 2 West Beijing Road, Nanjing, Jiangsu, 210008, China*
3. *University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, 19A Yuquan Road, Beijing, 100049, China*

Zhi Fu, Gao*

1. *Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, CAS, 150, Science 1-Street, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China*
2. *Key Laboratory of Radio Astronomy, Chinese Academy of Sciences, 2 West Beijing Road, Nanjing, Jiangsu, 210008, China*

Xiang Dong, Li

School of Astronomy and Space Science, Nanjing University, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China

Yan, Xu

Changchun Astronomical Observatory, National Observatories, CAS, Changchun, 130117, China

Pei, Wang

National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100012, China

Na, Wang

Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, CAS, 150, Science 1-Street, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China

Jianping, Yuan

Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, CAS, 150, Science 1-Street, Urumqi, Xinjiang, China

Received Day Month Year
Revised Day Month Year

Based on the basic definition of Fermi energy of degenerate and relativistic electrons, we obtain a special solution to electron Fermi energy, $E_F(e)$, and express $E_F(e)$ as a function of electron fraction, Y_e , and matter density, ρ . Several useful analytical formulae for Y_e and ρ within classical models and the work of Dutra et al. 2014 (Type-2) in relativistic mean field theory are obtained using numerically fitting. When describing the mean-field Lagrangian, density, we adopt the TMA parameter set, which is remarkably consistent with the updated astrophysical observations of neutron stars. Due to the

*zhifugao@xao.ac.cn

2 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

importance of the density dependence of the symmetry energy, S , in nuclear astrophysics, a brief discussion on the symmetry parameters S_0 and L (the slope of S) is presented. Combining these fit formulae with boundary conditions for different density regions, we can evaluate the value of $E_F(e)$ in any given matter density, and obtain a schematic diagram of $E_F(e)$ as a continuous function of ρ . Compared with previous study on the electron Fermi energy in other models, our methods of calculating $E_F(e)$ are more simple and convenient, and can be universally suitable for the relativistic electron regions in the circumstances of common neutron stars. We have deduced a general expression of $E_F(e)$ and n_e , which could be used to indirectly test whether one EoS of a NS is correct in our future studies on neutron star matter properties. Since URCA reactions are expected in the center of a massive star due to high-value electron Fermi energy and electron fraction, this study could be useful in the future studies on the NS thermal evolution.

Keywords: Neutron star; equation of state; electron Fermi energy

1. Introduction

Pulsars are among the most mysterious objects in the universe that provide natural laboratory for investigating the nature of matter under extreme conditions, and are universally recognized as normal neutron stars (NSs), but sometimes have been argued to be quark stars^{1,2,3}. The equation of state (EoS) of matter under exotic conditions is an important tool for the understanding of the nuclear force and for astrophysical applications. The Fermi energy of relativistic electrons $E_F(e)$ is one of most important and indispensable physical parameters in the EoS, and varies with matter density ρ . The electron Fermi energy influences directly weak-interaction processes including modified URCA reactions⁴, electron capture^{5,6,7,8,9} and so on, in the circumstance of a NS. These influences will change intrinsic EoS, interior structure and heat evolution, and even affect the whole properties of the star.

Another important physical parameter affecting internal properties of a NS is the electron fraction, which is defined as $Y_e = n_e/n_B$ (n_e and n_B are the electron number density, baryon number density, respectively, and varies with the high-density star matter. The value of average electron fraction is about 0.05 for a common NS^{4,10}. However, to exactly calculate the values of Y_e for the neutron star matter has long been a very challenging task for both the nuclear physics and the astrophysics community¹¹ due to some uncertainties and artificial assumptions in studying structures and properties of NSs. Currently, our knowledge of the electron fraction mainly comes from the model-dependence EoSs of NSs. For the β -equilibrated NS matter we have free neutron decay $n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$, which are governed by weak interaction and the electron capture process $p + e^- \rightarrow n + \nu_e$. Both types of reactions alter Y_e , and thus affect the EoS. However, in the currently popular and reliable EoSs of NSs, neutrinos generated in these reactions are always assumed to leave the system. The absence of neutrino surely has some influence on the EoS and mainly induces a significant change on the value of Y_e .

As we know, for degenerate and relativistic electrons in β -equilibrium, the distribution function $f(E_e)$ obeys Fermi-Dirac statistics: $f(E_e) = 1/(\exp((E_e - \mu_e)/kT) + 1)$, k represents Boltzmann's constant, and μ_e is the electron chemical

potential. If $T \rightarrow 0$, μ_e is also called the electron Fermi energy, $E_F(e)$, which presents the energy of highest occupied states for electrons. The electron Fermi energy $E_F(e)$ has the simple form

$$E_F(e) = (p_F^2(e)c^2 + m_e^2c^4)^{1/2}, \quad (1)$$

with $p_F(e)$ being the electron Fermi momentum. The isoenergetic surface of $E = E_F(e)$ is called the electron Fermi surface^{12,13,14}.

In the context of general relativity principle, the matter density is defined as: $\rho = \varepsilon/c^2$, ε is the total energy density, including the rest-mass energies of particles. Using the basic thermodynamics, we obtain the relation of the total matter pressure P and matter density ρ in a common NS,

$$\begin{aligned} P(n_B) &= n_B^2 \frac{d(\varepsilon/n_B)}{dn_B}, \\ \rho(n_B) &= \varepsilon(n_B)/c^2, \Rightarrow P = P(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

From the above equation, it is obvious that P solely depends on ρ . Theoretically, we can obtain the value of $E_F(e)$ by solving EOS in a specific matter model. In this paper, we mainly focus on $E_F(e)$ and Y_e for degenerate and relativistic electrons inside a common NS, where the magnetic effects on the EoS are ignored.

This paper is arranged as follows. In Sec. 2, we briefly review the structure of a NS. In Sec. 3, we deduce a special solution to $E_F(e)$. We apply the special solution obtained to numerically simulate $E_F(e)$ and Y_e of a NS within classical models in Sec. 4, and within the work of Dutra et al. 2014¹⁵ in Sec. 5. In Sec. 6 we present comparisons and discussions. The conclusion is presented in Sec.7.

2. Reviewing A NS' Structure

The structure of a NS includes an atmosphere and four main internal regions: the outer crust, inner crust, outer core, and inner core. The atmosphere is a thin layer of plasma which determines the spectrum of thermal electromagnetic radiation of the star. The geometrical depth of the atmosphere varies from some ten centimeters in a hot star down to some millimeters in a cold one.

The knowledge of structures and properties of the crust plays an important role in understanding many astrophysical observations^{16,17,18,19}. The outer crust consists of nuclei in a Coulomb lattice and electron gas, and has a depth of a few hundred meters. At $\rho \leq 10^4 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, the electron gas may be non-degenerate, and the ionization may be incomplete; at $\rho < 10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, the ground state may be ^{56}Fe ; at $\rho \sim 10^9 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, the nuclei capture electrons and become neutron-rich, and at the neutron drip density ρ_d , the neutrons start to drip from the nuclei and form a free neutron gas. The neutron drip density ρ_d is well determined^{20,21} to be about $4.3 \times 10^{11} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

The inner crust of a NS spans the region from the neutron drip point to the inner edge separating the solid crust from the liquid core, and has several kilometers deep.

4 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

The matter of the inner crust in nuclear equilibrium consists of neutron-rich nuclei in a Coulomb lattice, electrons, and free neutrons. As matter density increases, free neutrons supply an increasingly large fraction of the total matter pressure P . At the crust-core transition density, ρ_t , the baryon number density reaches a critical value, and nuclei dissolve and merge together.

The outer core consists of neutrons, protons and electrons (hereinafter “ npe system”), spans a density range of about $0.5\rho_0 \sim 2.5\rho_0$, and has a depth of several kilometers, $\rho_0 = 2.8 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ is the standard nuclear density. At the inner edge of the outer core small fraction of muons (μ) may appear⁴, because the electron Fermi energy could exceed the muon rest-mass energy $m_\mu c^2 = 105.7 \text{ MeV}$. However, a definite boundary between the outer core and inner core has not yet been obtained due to the uncertainty of crust-core transition density.

The inner core is about several kilometers in radius, and has a central density as high as $\sim 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. With still further increase of density, the inner core becomes energetically more economic if some nucleons transform to exotic particles such as hyperons, pion condensates, kaon condensates and quarks, etc., when $\rho > \rho_{tr}$, here ρ_{tr} is the transition density to these exotic particles, which is $\sim 4\rho_0$ ²². The maximum of the inner core density could exceed this transition density, so hyperons, pion condensates, kaon condensates, quarks and nucleons with large Y_e are expected to exist in the inner core of a NS.

3. Electron Fermi Energy And Its Special Solution

3.1. General relation of $E_F(e)$, Y_e and ρ

In the interior of a common NS with $B \sim 10^{10} - 10^{12} \text{ G}$, the isoenergetic surface of degenerate and relativistic electrons is a spherical surface, and the microscopic state number of electrons in a unit volume, N_{pha} , is calculated by

$$N_{pha} = n_e = \frac{g}{h^3} \int_0^{p_F(e)} 4\pi p^2 dp = \frac{8\pi}{3h^3} p_F^3(e). \quad (3)$$

where h is Plank’s constant. For the convenience of calculations, we introduce a dimensionless momentum of electrons, $x_e = p_F(e)/m_e c$. According to Paulis exclusion principle, the electron number density is equal to its microscopic state density,

$$n_e = N_{pha} = \frac{8\pi}{3\lambda_e^3} x_e^3, \quad (4)$$

where $\lambda_e = h/m_e c = 2.4263 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}$ is the electron Compton wavelength. The average mass of a baryon m_B is defined as

$$m_B \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_i n_i m_i = \frac{\sum_i n_i m_i}{\sum_i n_i A_i}, \quad (5)$$

with A_i the baryon number of species i . In the interior of a NS, the relation of $m_B \equiv m_u \equiv 1.6606 \times 10^{-24} \text{ g}$ always holds, m_u is the mass of an atom. Thus, the

matter density can be expressed as:

$$\rho = n_B m_B = \frac{n_e m_B}{Y_e}, \quad (6)$$

Combining Eq.(5) with Eq.(6), we get

$$x_e = \left(\frac{3\lambda_e^3}{8\pi m_u} Y_e \rho \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (7)$$

Inserting the values of λ_e and m_u into Eq.(7) gives

$$x_e = 1.0088 \times 10^{-2} (Y_e \rho)^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (8)$$

Since the average molecule weight of electrons $\mu_e = \frac{m_B}{m_u Y_e} = \frac{1}{Y_e}$, we get

$$\rho = \mu_e m_u n_e = 0.97395 \times 10^6 \frac{x_e^3}{Y_e}, \quad (9)$$

Combining Eq.(1) with Eqs.(8) and (9), we get the electron Fermi energy

$$E_F(e) = m_e c^2 (1 + x_e^2)^{1/2} = [1 + 1.018 \times 10^{-4} (\rho Y_e)^{\frac{2}{3}}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \times 0.511 \text{ MeV}. \quad (10)$$

The expression above is a general formula for the electron Fermi energy, which is approximately suitable for relativistic electron matter regions ($\rho \geq 8.6 \times 10^6 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$) in the whole interior of a common NS. If $x_e = p_e/m_e c \gg 1$, Eq.(10) can be approximately reduced as $E_F(e) \approx 5.16 \times 10^{-3} (\rho Y_e)^{\frac{1}{3}} \text{ MeV}$.

3.2. Special solution to $E_F(e)$

In this part, in order to obtain a special solution to $E_F(e)$, we consider an ideal $n - p - e$ system under β -equilibrium in the outer core, where electrons are relativistic, neutrons and protons are non-relativistic. According to Shapiro & eukolsky (1983)¹⁰ (hereinafter “ST-83”), when $\rho \gg 10^{13} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, the neutron pressure dominates in the interior of a NS, and $\rho \approx m_n n_n$, then the neutron number density $n_n = 1.7 \times 10^{38} (\rho/\rho_0) \text{ cm}^{-3}$, the charge neutrality requires the proton number density $n_p = n_e = 9.6 \times 10^{35} (\rho/\rho_0)^2 \text{ cm}^{-3}$; β -equilibrium implies momentum conservation of $p_F(p) = p_F(e) = 60(\rho/\rho_0)^{2/3} \text{ MeV/c}$, thus the electron Fermi energy

$$E_F(e) = 60(\rho/\rho_0)^{2/3} \text{ MeV}, \quad (11)$$

where $p_F(p)$ is the proton Fermi momentum. A simple proof of Eq.(11) is presented as follows: From the relations of n_p , n_e and n_n above, we get

$$Y_e = Y_p \approx \frac{n_e}{n_n} \approx 0.005647 \times \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right), \quad (12)$$

where Y_p is the proton fraction. Combining Eq.(12) with Eq.(10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_F(e) &= [1 + 1.018 \times 10^{-4} (\rho \times 0.005647 (\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}))^{\frac{2}{3}}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \times 0.511 \\ &= [1 + 1.018 \times 10^{-4} (2.8 \times 10^{14} \times 0.005647 (\frac{\rho}{\rho_0})^2)^{\frac{2}{3}}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \times 0.511 \\ &= [1 + 1.018 \times 10^{-4} (1.58116 \times 10^{12})^{\frac{2}{3}}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \times (\frac{\rho}{\rho_0})^{\frac{2}{3}} \times 0.511 = 60 \times (\frac{\rho}{\rho_0})^{\frac{2}{3}} \text{ (MeV)}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

6 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

The above proof indicates that Eq.(10) is an accurate expression. Inserting Eq.(12) into Eq.(11) yields

$$\begin{aligned} E_F(e) &= 60 \times \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} = 60 \times \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{\frac{\rho_0 Y_e}{0.005647}}{\rho_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ &= 60 \times \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(\frac{Y_e}{0.005647}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (\text{MeV}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The equation above is a special solution to $E_F(e)$, which is suitable relativistic electron matter region of a common NS.

3.3. Test the validity of the special solution

To test the validity of the special solution to $E_F(e)$, we will calculate the values of $E_F(e)$ in the work of Baym, Bethe & Pethick (1971)²³ (hereinafter “BBP model”) by using Eq.(14), and will compare our results with those of BBP model. By introducing a compressible liquid drop model of nuclei, BBP model is more successful than other models in describing matter in the inner crust, where the system becomes a mixture of nuclei, free neutrons, and electrons. According to BBP model²³, the total energy density ε and the total matter pressure P of the system are described by

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= \varepsilon_e(n_e) + n_N(W_N + W_L) + n_n(1 - V_N n_N)W_n, \\ P &= P_n + P_e + P_L \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where n_n is the number density of neutrons outside of nuclei (hereinafter “neutron gas”), and the new feature is the dependence on the volume of a nucleus V_N , which decreases with the outside pressure of the neutron gas; P_n , P_e and P_L are the neutron gas pressure, electron pressure, and lattice pressure, respectively. The baryon number density in this model is

$$n_B = A n_N + (1 - V_N n_N) n_n, \quad (16)$$

where $V_N n_N$ and $1 - V_N n_N$ are the fraction of volume occupied by nuclei, and the fraction occupied by neutron gas, respectively. Then $E_F(e)$ is determined by

$$E_F(e) = \frac{\partial \varepsilon_e}{\partial n_e} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n_e}(n_e E_e) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial Z}(E_N + E_L). \quad (17)$$

The values of $E_F(e)$ in BBP model are partly listed in Table 1. The sign ‘†’ denotes that ρ_m is the maximum equilibrium density at which the nuclide is present. The data of columns 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 are cited from Table 2 of Canuto (1974)²⁴. The electron fraction $Y_e = Y_p = \frac{Z n_N I}{n_B} \simeq \frac{Z n_N}{\rho/m_u}$, and the values of $E_F(e)$ in column 8 are obtained using the specific solution of Eq.(14).

In Table 1 the magnitude of $|\frac{E_F'(e) - E_F(e)}{E_F(e)}|$ is $\sim 10^{-3}$, which illustrates that our calculations are consistent with those of BBP²³. From the comparison above, our method of calculating $E_F(e)$ is more simple and convenient than that in BBP model.

Table 1. Calculations of Y_e and $E_F(e)$ in BBP model.

$\rho_m^\dagger$ g cm ⁻³	A	Z	n_N 10 ⁻⁶ fm ⁻³	n_B cm ⁻³	Y_e	$E_F(e)$ MeV	$E'_F(e)$ MeV
4.66×10^{11}	127	40	2.02	2.806×10^{35}	0.2879	26.31	26.36
6.61×10^{11}	130	40	2.13	3.981×10^{35}	0.2140	26.98	26.83
8.79×10^{11}	134	41	2.23	5.293×10^{35}	0.1727	27.51	27.47
1.20×10^{12}	137	42	2.34	7.226×10^{35}	0.1360	28.13	28.14
1.47×10^{12}	140	42	2.43	8.852×10^{35}	0.1153	28.58	28.51
2.00×10^{12}	144	43	2.58	1.204×10^{36}	0.0921	29.33	29.30
2.67×10^{12}	149	44	2.74	1.608×10^{36}	0.0749	30.15	30.12
3.51×10^{12}	154	45	2.93	2.114×10^{36}	0.0624	31.05	31.04
4.54×10^{12}	161	46	3.14	2.734×10^{36}	0.0528	32.02	32.00
6.25×10^{12}	170	48	3.45	3.764×10^{36}	0.0439	33.43	33.47
8.38×10^{12}	181	49	3.82	5.046×10^{36}	0.0371	34.98	34.90
1.10×10^{13}	193	51	4.23	6.624×10^{36}	0.0326	36.68	36.59
1.50×10^{13}	211	54	4.84	9.033×10^{36}	0.0289	39.00	38.98
1.99×10^{13}	232	57	5.54	1.198×10^{37}	0.0264	41.58	41.56
2.58×10^{13}	257	60	6.36	1.554×10^{37}	0.0246	44.37	44.26
3.44×10^{13}	296	65	7.52	2.071×10^{37}	0.0236	48.10	48.04
4.68×10^{13}	354	72	9.12	2.818×10^{37}	0.0233	52.95	53.01
5.96×10^{13}	421	78	10.7	3.589×10^{37}	0.0235	57.56	57.62
8.01×10^{13}	548	89	13.1	4.824×10^{37}	0.0242	64.32	64.21
9.83×10^{13}	683	100	15.0	5.920×10^{37}	0.0253	69.81	69.78
1.30×10^{14}	990	120	17.8	7.828×10^{37}	0.0273	78.58	78.56
1.72×10^{14}	1640	157	19.6	1.035×10^{38}	0.0297	88.84	88.70

Be noted that, as a representative model, BBP model is arbitrarily selected to test the validity of the specific solution to $E_F(e)$. In this part, other matter models will no longer be enumerated, due to the restriction of space.

4. Numerically Simulating $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in A NS (I)

In this Section, we will numerically fit the relation of Y_e and ρ in the whole interior of a NS, according to several reliable EoSs within simple but classical matter models. Combining the analytic expressions of Y_e and ρ with the special solution to $E_F(e)$, we will obtain schematic diagrams of $E_F(e)$ vs. ρ in different density regions for relativistic electrons.

4.1. Numerically fitting in the outer crust

By introducing the lattice energy, Baym, Pethick & Sutherland (1971)²⁰ (hereafter “BPS model”) improved on Salpeter’s treatment²⁵, and described the nuclear composition and EoS for catalyzed matter in complete thermodynamic equilibrium below ρ_d . BPS model is one of most successful models describing matter of the outer crust. According to BPS model, the total energy density ε and the total matter pressure P are described by

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon_N + \varepsilon_e + \varepsilon_L,$$

8 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

$$P = P_e + P_L = P_e + \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_L, \quad (18)$$

where ε_N is the energy density of nucleus, ε_e the energy density of free electrons, and ε_L the *bcc* Coulomb lattice energy in a unit volume. The value of $E_F(e)$ is obtained by solving the following differential equation,

$$E_F(e) = \mu_e = \frac{\partial \varepsilon_e}{\partial n_e} = \frac{\partial}{\partial n_e}(n_e E_e). \quad (19)$$

For the specific equilibrium nuclei (A, Z) in BPS model, the values of quantities Y_e , ρ_m , and $E_F(e)$ are tabulated in Table 2.

Table 2. Values of Y_e , ρ_m , and $E_F(e)$ in BPS model below neutron drop.

Nuclei	Y_e	ρ_m g cm ⁻³	$E_F(e)$ MeV	Nuclei	Y_e	ρ_m g cm ⁻³	$E_F(e)$ MeV
⁵⁶ Fe	0.4643	8.1×10 ⁶	0.95	⁷⁸ Ni	0.3590	8.21×10 ¹⁰	20.0
²⁶ Fe				²⁸ Fe	0.3421	1.8×10 ¹¹	20.20
⁶² Ni	0.4516	2.7×10 ⁸	2.60	⁷⁶ Fe			
²⁸ Ni				²⁶ Mo	0.3387	1.9×10 ¹¹	20.50
⁶⁴ Ni	0.4375	1.2×10 ⁹	4.20	¹²⁴ Mo			
²⁸ Se				⁴² Zr	0.3279	2.7×10 ¹¹	22.90
⁸⁴ Se	0.4048	8.2×10 ⁹	7.70	⁴⁰ Zr			
³⁴ Ge				¹²⁰ Sr	0.3167	3.7×10 ¹¹	25.2
⁸² Ge	0.3902	2.2×10 ¹⁰	10.60	³⁸ Sr			
³² Zn				¹¹⁸ Kr	0.3051	4.3×10 ¹¹	26.20
⁸⁰ Zn	0.3750	5.91×10 ¹⁰	13.60	³⁶ Kr			
³⁰ Zn							




Fig. 1. Numerically fitting in the outer crust. Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ . Dot-dashed lines are the fitting curves, and circles denote the values of Y_e (or $E_F(e)$) and ρ for each individual nuclide in BPS model.

Be note that the relation of $Y_e = Y_p = Z/A$ always approximately holds in BPS model. From Table 2, it's obvious that Y_e decreases with ρ . Combining Eq.(20) with the special solution, we plot the diagram of $E_F(e)$ and ρ , and compare our results with those in BPS model. From Fig. 1(b), it's obvious that $E_F(e)$ increases with ρ in BPS model. Theoretically, employing Eq.(20), we can obtain an approximate value of $E_F(e)$, given a matter density of the outer crust.

4.2. Numerically fitting in the inner crust

The uncertainty of crust-core transition density mainly comes from limited knowledge of EoS, especially the density-dependence symmetry energy of neutron-rich nuclear matter^{26,27}. Employing the method of quantum mechanics, Negele & Vautherin (1973)²⁸(hereinafter “NV model”) firstly obtained the value of $\rho_t \sim 1.32 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. Recently, Atta & Basu (2014) obtained the value of $1.54 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ (or $\rho_t \sim 0.0938 \text{ fm}^{-3}$) in the *M3Y* nucleon-nucleon effective interaction model²⁹.




Fig. 2. The diagram of Y_e vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ in the lower density region in the inner crust. The range of ρ is $(4.3 \times 10^{11} \sim 6.25 \times 10^{12}) \text{ g cm}^{-3}$; Dot-dashed lines is the fitting curve, and circles denote the values of Y_e and ρ for each individual nuclide in BBP model.

However, Atta & Basu (2014)²⁹ obtained $Y_e \sim 0.031$, which is very close to the value $Y_e \sim 0.032$ in NV model²⁸.

Here we select $\rho_d = 4.3 \times 10^{11} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, corresponding to $Y_e \approx 0.3051$ and $E_F(e) \approx 26.2 \text{ MeV}$, in BPS model, and select $\rho_t = 1.32 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ in NV model. Since the nuclei have dissolved by merging together at the base of the inner crust, the matter begins to turn into an ideal *npe* system. From ST-83, we obtain $Y_e \approx 0.0026$ and $E_F(e) \approx 36.3 \text{ MeV}$ at $\rho = \rho_t$.

Although the EoS above ρ_d is reasonably well understood by BBP model, this model in a higher density region $\rho \geq 1.72 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ was criticized by some authors^{24,10,13}, due to a monotonic and arbitrary increase of Z with A , which causes the relation of P and ρ to be changed not much. Thus, we stop listing related calculations in the higher density region. For convenience, the inner crust can be roughly divided into two regions: a lower density region, and a higher density region. The matter in the lower density region is still described by BBP model, whereas matter in the higher density region is described by an ideal mixed model(hereinafter “IM model”). With respect to IM model, our main hypotheses are as follows:

- (1) Though matter in IM model is also a mixture of nuclei, free neutrons and free electron gas, the details of nucleon-nucleon interactions may be ignored, due to

10 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

the uncertainty of nuclei compositions in IM model.

- (2) The matter in IM model distributes in a range of $\sim 10^{12} \sim 1.32 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, $E_F(e)$ grows with ρ smoothly, but the growth is not too much.
- (3) Nuclei in IM model are more neutron-rich, and thus the values of Y_e are universally smaller than those in BBP model, given the same matter densities.
- (4) The electron fraction steadily decreases with matter density until $\rho = \rho_t$. To insure that $E_F(e)$ increases with ρ , and Y_e decrease with ρ in IM model, the initial density of IM model, ρ_{IM} , should be $1.0 \times 10^{13} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, we arbitrarily select $\rho_m = 6.25 \times 10^{12} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ for ground state nucleus $^{170}_{48}\text{Cd}$ in BBP model to be ρ_{IM} for IM model.

Based on Table 1, we plot a diagram of Y_e and ρ in the lower density region of the inner crust, as shown in Fig. 2. By numerically fitting, we obtain an analytical expression of Y_e and ρ ,

$$Y_e = 0.0164 - 214.87e^{-\text{Log}_{10}\rho} + 3.67 \times 10^9 e^{-2\text{Log}_{10}\rho}. \quad (20)$$

in the range of $4.3 \times 10^{11} \sim 6.25 \times 10^{12} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. Due to lack of a detailed information on IM model introduced by this work, we cannot give an exact formula of Y_e and ρ for the higher density region. However, we mainly focus on the special solution to $E_F(e)$ and its potential applications. We assume that $E_F(e)$ grows with ρ exponentially, and the expression of $E_F(e)$ and ρ has a simple exponential form,

$$E_F(e) = A + Be^{\text{Log}_{10}\rho} \text{ MeV}, \quad (21)$$

in the higher density region. Employing the boundary conditions: (1) $\rho = \rho_{IM} = 6.25 \times 10^{12} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, $Y_e \approx 0.0439$, $E_F(e) \approx 33.43 \text{ MeV}$, (2) $\rho = \rho_t = 1.32 \times 10^{12} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, $Y_e \approx 0.0026$, $E_F(e) \approx 36.3 \text{ MeV}$, we obtain the values of two constants, $A = 32.4$ and $B = 2.882 \times 10^{-6}$. Combining the special solution of Eq.(14) with Eq.(22), we obtain an analytical formula,

$$Y_e \approx 0.005647 \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\rho} \right) (0.539 + 4.803 \times 10^{-8} e^{\text{Log}_{10}\rho})^3, \quad (22)$$

in the higher density region. The relations of Y_e and ρ , and $E_F(e)$ and ρ in the inner crust are shown in Fig.3.

In addition, we calculate the values of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in IM model, as listed in column 4 and column 5 of Table 3, respectively. The data of columns 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 are cited from Table 1 in this paper. The data of columns 4, 5, 9 and 10 are obtained from IM model using Eq.(14) and Eq.(24). From Table 3, IM model may be superior to BBP model in the higher density region.

4.3. Numerically fitting in the outer core

The numerical simulations in the outer core are usually subject to two distinct uncertainties: (1) determining the nuclear potential for nucleon-nucleon interaction, and (2) finding an appropriate technique for solving the many-body problem. The

Table 3. Values of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in BBP model and IM model.

ρ (g cm ⁻³)	Y_e'	$E_F(e)'$ MeV	$E_F(e)$ MeV	Y_e	ρ (g cm ⁻³)	Y_e'	$E_F(e)'$ MeV	$E_F(e)$ MeV	Y_e
6.25×10^{12}	0.0439	33.43	33.43	0.0439	3.44×10^{13}	0.0236	48.10	34.57	0.0088
8.38×10^{12}	0.0371	34.98	33.57	0.0434	4.68×10^{13}	0.0233	52.95	34.88	0.0066
1.10×10^{13}	0.0326	36.68	33.72	0.0255	5.96×10^{13}	0.0235	57.56	35.16	0.0053
1.50×10^{13}	0.0289	39.00	33.91	0.0190	8.01×10^{13}	0.0242	64.32	35.54	0.0041
1.99×10^{13}	0.0264	41.58	34.11	0.0146	1.99×10^{13}	0.0264	41.58	34.11	0.0146
2.58×10^{13}	0.0246	44.37	34.31	0.0115	2.58×10^{13}	0.0246	44.37	34.31	0.0115

nuclear potential is constrained somewhat by nucleon-nucleon scattering data and nuclear matter results^{30,31}.

As mentioned in Section 3.2, the matter in the outer core contains relativistic electrons, non-relativistic neutrons, and non-relativistic protons. Here, for the sake of simplicity, we consider a homogenous ideal npe system under β -equilibrium, and adopt ST-83 approximation¹⁰⁾ as the main method to treat EoS of this system. The relation of Y_e and ρ is described by

$$Y_e \approx \frac{n_e}{n_n} = 0.005647 \times \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right), \quad (23)$$

in the density range of $0.5\rho_0 \sim 2.5\rho_0$ (c.f. Sec. 2.2), Combining the above equation with the special solution, we plot schematic diagrams of Y_e vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ and $E_F(e)$ vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ in the outer core of a NS, as shown in Fig. 4.

4.4. Numerically simulating in the inner core

Although the maximum inner-core-density could exceed the transition density ρ_{tr} ²², for the sake of simplicity, we focus on a non-relativistic domain of $\sim 2.5\rho_0 \sim 2.0 \times 10^{15}$ g cm⁻³, and consider a system, composed of neutrons, protons, elec-




Fig. 3. Numerically fitting in the inner crust. Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ . The range of ρ is $(4.3 \times 10^{11} \sim 1.32 \times 10^{14})$ g cm⁻³; Dot-dashed lines are for BBP model; and dotted line and solid line are for IM model.

12 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*




Fig. 4. Numerically fitting in the outer core. Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ . The range of ρ is $(1.32 \times 10^{14} \sim 8.2 \times 10^{14}) \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

trons and muons under β -equilibrium. Here our first aim is to deduce an analytical expression of Y_e and ρ in the inner core. A detailed deduction is summarized as follows:

When $E_F(e)$ is high enough, it is energetically favorable for electrons to turn into muons, so that muons and electrons are in equilibrium: $\mu^- \leftrightarrow e^-$, here we have as usual assumed that the neutrinos leave the system. Once we know this equilibrium, thermodynamics does not require us to know any detail of the process of $\mu^- \leftrightarrow e^-$. Chemical potential equilibrium and charge neutrality give

$$\begin{aligned} m_\mu c^2(1 + x_\mu^2)^{1/2} &= m_e c^2(1 + x_e^2)^{1/2}, \\ m_n c^2(1 + x_n^2)^{1/2} &= m_p c^2(1 + x_p^2)^{1/2} + m_e c^2(1 + x_e^2)^{1/2}, \\ (m_p x_p)^3 &= (m_e x_e)^3 + (m_\mu x_\mu)^3. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where $x_i = p_F(i)/m_i c$ ($i = n, p, e, \mu$) is the dimensionless Fermi momenta. From Eq.(24), the electron fraction can be expressed as a function of x_e ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_e = \frac{n_e}{n_B} &\approx \frac{n_e}{n_n} = \frac{(m_e x_e)^3}{(m_n x_n)^3} = \frac{m_e^3 x_e^3}{m_n^3 \left\{ \left[\frac{m_p}{m_n} (1 + x_p^2)^{1/2} + \frac{m_e}{m_n} (1 + x_e^2)^{1/2} \right]^2 - 1 \right\}^{3/2}}, \\ &= \frac{m_e^3 x_e^3}{m_n^3 \left\{ \left[1 + \frac{m_e^2 x_e^2 + m_\mu^2 \left(\frac{m_e^2 x_e^2}{m_\mu^2} - 1 \right)^{3/2}}{2m_p^2} + \frac{m_e (1 + x_e^2)^{1/2}}{m_n} \right]^2 - 1 \right\}^{3/2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we used $m_p/m_n \approx 1$ and $\mu_\mu = \mu_e$. Inserting $m_e = 0.511 \text{ MeV}$, $m_p = 938.28 \text{ MeV}$, $m_n = 939.57 \text{ MeV}$, and $m_\mu = 105.7 \text{ MeV}$, into Eqs.(25), we obtain a schematic diagram of Y_e and x_e in the inner core of a NS. From Fig. 5, it's obvious that Y_e increases with x_e in the inner core of a NS.

The threshold density for muons to appear, ρ_μ , is also an important issue. When at ρ_μ , $n_\mu = 0$ that is $x_\mu = 0$. Since the electrons are highly relativistic, we can take $x_e \gg 1$, Eq.(24) becomes

$$m_\mu = m_e x_e,$$




Fig. 5. The relation of Y_e and x_e for $npe - \mu$ system in the inner core of a NS.

$$\begin{aligned} m_n c^2 (1 + x_n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} &= m_p c^2 (1 + x_p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} + m_e x_e, \\ m_p x_p &= m_e x_e. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Inserting the values of m_e , m_p , m_n , and m_μ into Eq.(26), we get $x_e = 206.8$, $x_p = 0.1126$, and $x_n = 0.4986$, corresponding to $\rho_\mu = 8.21 \times 10^{14} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. Combining Eq.(25) with the expression of $x_e = 1.0088 \times 10^{-2} (Y_e \rho)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ with , we calculate the values of Y_e in the range of $8.2 \times 10^{14} \sim 2.0 \times 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, as shown in Fig. 6(a). By fitting these values of Y_e and ρ , we obtain an analytical formula of Y_e and ρ

$$Y_e \approx -0.0115 + 7.402 \times 10^{-9} e^{\text{Log}_{10} \rho}, \quad (27)$$

in the inner core of a NS. Combining Eq.(27) with the special solution, we plot the diagram of $E_F(e)$ and ρ , as shown in Fig. 6(b). Here we arbitrarily select a maximum




Fig. 6. Numerically fitting in the inner core. Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ . The range of ρ is assumed to be $8.2 \times 10^{14} \sim 2.0 \times 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ arbitrarily.

14 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

density $2.0 \times 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ for the inner core matter, because at higher densities (more than $10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$), the composition is expected to include an appreciable number of hyperons, and the nucleon interactions must be treated relativistically. In a real scenario, matter in the inner core could be more complicated than that of ideal $npe\mu$ system.

4.5. Summary

As to the main purpose and innovations for the simulations above, a brief summary is presented as follows:




Fig. 7. Numerically fitting Y_e and $E_F(e)$ in the whole interior of a NS. Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ .

- (1) Firstly, in the previous studies, there are too many matter models, some of which are rather successful and thus representative. By solving the EoSs of these models (including the above models), we can obtain the relations of $E_F(e)$ vs. ρ and Y_e vs. ρ . However, there still exist limitations for each EoS to some extent. For example, any EoS has a certain application range of matter density, the resulting values of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e will deviate from those in the actual scenario if the EoS is beyond of its application range of density.
- (2) Secondly, up to now, we have not obtained a uniform EoS of one certain matter model, which is excellent in describing the relations of $E_F(e)$, Y_e and ρ in the whole interior of a NS. By numerically simulating, we have obtained a set of analytical expressions for $E_F(e)$, Y_e and ρ from EoSs. However, this is not our main purpose. Our ultimate aim is to investigate the whole variation trends in Y_e vs. ρ and $E_F(e)$ vs. ρ in the whole relativistic electron matter region of a NS using these analytical expressions obtained.
- (3) Thirdly, as we know, the electron Fermi energy, as well as the electron pressure, is always continuous in the interior of a NS. From the general formula for $E_F(e)$ (see Eq.(10)), Y_e is also a continuous function of ρ in a NS. Utilizing the boundary conditions and the fitting formula of $E_F(e)$, Y_e and ρ in four matter

regions (the outer crust, inner crust, outer core, and inner core), we obtain the values of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e , which are smooth and continuous functions of matter density, as well shown in Fig.7.

- (4) At last, we can see that the electron fraction Y_e firstly decreases in the crust, then increases in the core (from Fig.7(a)). The decrease in Y_e is caused by increasing neutronization of nuclei, as the depths of the crust increases, whereas the increase in Y_e is due to the fact that, the proton fraction Y_p always increases with the core matter density required by the chemical potential equilibrium under β - equilibrium, and the charge neutrality gives $n_p = n_e + n_\mu$. Be note that n_μ is far less than n_e given a matter density. From Fig.7(b), the electron Fermi energy always increases with matter density, the reason for the increase in $E_F(e)$ is that $E_F(e)$ solely depends on n_e , which always increases with ρ (for details see in Sec.6.)

It should be admitted that our method of fitting Y_e and $E_F(e)$ is somewhat simple, but is practically convenient. Especially, it is convenient to calculate the value of $E_F(e)$ given a matter density inside a NS.

5. Numerically Simulating $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in A NS (II)

As mentioned in Sec.4, numerically fitting $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in the core of a NS are subject to many uncertainties, including the possibility of neutron and proton superfluid, of pion condensation, of phase transitions to quark matter^{2,3}, and the consequences of the Δ resonances^{32,33}. To date, many of relativistic models^{34,35,36,37,38} have drawn attentions in investigating EoSs because they are particularly suited for describing NSs according to the special relativity. The most common among them is the relativistic-mean- field (RMF) theory, which has become a standard method to study nuclear matter and finite-nuclei properties.

As an up-to-date representative theoretical work in RMF theory is Dutra et al. (2014)¹⁵, in which 263 RMF models are examined three different sets of constraints related to pure neutron matter, symmetric nuclear matter, symmetry energy, and its derivatives are used. The authors gave a detailed discussion of these models when investigating properties like realistic values of the asymmetry energy and its slope, compressibility and the question that whether the EoS can actually reproduce 2-solar mass stars, as have been observed in PSR J1615-2230³⁹, within the whole NS interior, and added extensive supernova EOS online tables (like on <http://compose.obspm.fr>).

According to RMF theory, baryonic interactions include three cases: (1) exchanging three mesons of σ , ω and ρ ; (2) exchanging four mesons of σ , ω , ρ and σ ; (3) exchanging five mesons of σ , ω , ρ , σ^* , ϕ . In order to provide a new insight into application of RMF models to the nuclear matter properties, Dutra et al. (2014) considered the four-meson-exchange baryonic interactions, and divided the RMF models into seven types regarding their lagrangian density structures: Typ1-1: linear finite range models in which $A = B = C = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha'_1 = \alpha'_2 = \alpha'_3 = g_\sigma = 0$;

16 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

Type-2: $\sigma^3 + \sigma^4$ models in which $C = \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha'_1 = \alpha'_2 = \alpha'_3 = g_\sigma = 0$; Type-3: $\sigma^3 + \sigma^4 + \omega_0^4$ models in which $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha'_1 = \alpha'_2 = \alpha'_3 = g_\sigma = 0$; Type-4: $\sigma^3 + \sigma^4 + \omega_0^4$ + cross terms models in which $g_\sigma = 0$ and at least one of the coupling constants, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha'_1, \alpha'_2$, or α'_3 is different from zero; Type-5: density-dependent models in which $g_\delta \rightarrow T_\delta(\rho) = 0$; Type-6: point-coupling models in which $g_\delta \neq 0$; and Type-7: δ -meson models in which $a_{TS} = 0$. For the physical meaning of each parameter above, see Dutra et al. (2014).

In this paper, for the purpose of comparing with the classical models applied in Sec.4, we will choose Type-2 in Dutra et al. (2014) as a representative RMF theoretical work. The main merit of Type-2 in Dutra et al (2014) lies in that it describes well the properties of EoS of a NS in the vicinity of the saturated nuclear density ρ_0 .

From Eq.(1) of Dutra et al. (2014), we get the effective lagrangian of Type-2 in Dutra et al (2014)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \sum_B \bar{\psi}_B [i\gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - m_B - g_{\sigma B} \sigma - g_{\omega B} \gamma_\mu \omega^\mu - g_{\rho B} \gamma_\mu \tau_i \rho_i^\mu] \psi_B \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \sigma \partial^\mu \sigma - \frac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{3} g_2 \sigma^3 - \frac{1}{4} g_3 \sigma^4 - \frac{1}{4} W_{\mu\nu} W^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu \\ & - \frac{1}{4} R_{i\mu\nu} R_i^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho_{i\mu} \rho_i^\mu + \sum_l \bar{\psi}_l [i\gamma_\mu \partial^\mu - m_l] \psi_l, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where the baryon species are marked as B, and the sum on l is over electrons and muons (e^- and μ^-). In the RMF models, the meson fields are treated as classical fields, and the field operators are replaced by their expectation values. The meson field equations in uniform matter have the following form:

$$m_\sigma^2 \sigma + g_2 \sigma^2 + g_3 \sigma^3 = - \sum_B \frac{g_{\sigma B}}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F^B} \frac{m_B^*}{\sqrt{k^2 + m_B^{*2}}} k^2 dk, \quad (29)$$

$$m_\omega^2 \omega + c_3 \omega^3 = \sum_B \frac{g_{\omega B} (k_F^B)^3}{3\pi^2}, \quad (30)$$

$$m_\rho^2 \rho = \sum_B \frac{g_{\rho B} \tau_{3B} (k_F^B)^3}{3\pi^2}, \quad (31)$$

where $\sigma = \langle \sigma \rangle$, $\omega = \langle \omega^0 \rangle$, and $\rho = \langle \rho^{30} \rangle$, are the nonvanishing expectation values of meson fields in NS matter, $m_B^* = m_B + g_{\sigma B} \sigma$ is the effective mass of the baryon species B , and k_F^B is the Fermi momentum. At zero temperature the lepton chemical potentials are expressed by

$$\mu_l = \sqrt{k_F^l{}^2 + m_l^2}, \quad (\text{fm}^{-1}) \quad (32)$$

The charge neutrality condition is given by

$$\sum_B q_B \rho_B - n_e - n_\mu = 0, \quad (33)$$

where $\sum_B q_B = n_B$, and q_B is the baryon electric charge. We can solve the coupled equations self-consistently at a given baryon density. Then we get the total energy density ε and pressure P

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon = & \sum_B \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F^B} \sqrt{k^2 + m_B^{*2}} k^2 dk + \frac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{3} g_2 \sigma^3 + \frac{1}{4} g_3 \sigma^4 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega^2 + \frac{3}{4} c_3 \omega^4 + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho^2 + \sum_l \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F^l} \sqrt{k^2 + m_l^2} k^2 dk, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P = & \frac{1}{3} \sum_B \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F^B} \frac{k^4 dk}{\sqrt{k^2 + m_B^{*2}}} - \frac{1}{2} m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2 - \frac{1}{3} g_2 \sigma^3 - \frac{1}{4} g_3 \sigma^4 \\ & + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega^2 + \frac{1}{4} c_3 \omega^4 + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \rho^2 + \frac{1}{3} \sum_l \frac{1}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F^l} \frac{k^4 dk}{\sqrt{k^2 + m_l^2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In the work of Dutra et al. (2014), the authors listed more than 130 RMF models for Type-2. These models have been widely used because of several important aspects not always present in non-relativistic models (e.g., intrinsic Lorentz covariance, appropriate saturation mechanism for nuclear matter and etc). Unfortunately, the authors didn't present any information on the electron Fermi energy and electron fraction within these models, due to the restriction of space.


In order to obtain better agreement for the behavior of EOS at high matter densities with that predicted by the relativistic Brueckner-Hartree-Fock theory, the parameter set TMA was developed, based on two other widely used parameter sets, TM1 and TM2⁴⁰. The parameter set TMA has been one of the most successful modern parameter sets. In this work, we select the parameter set TMA^{41,42} for the mean-field Lagrangian density, and list the parameter values in Table 4.

Table 4. The parameter values of the effective force TMA used in the calculation.

m_N MeV	m_σ MeV	m_ω MeV	m_ρ MeV	g_σ (fm) ⁻¹	g_ω (fm) ⁻¹	g_ρ (fm) ⁻¹	g_2 (fm) ⁻¹	g_3 (fm) ⁻¹	c_3 (fm) ⁻¹
939.0	519.151	781.950	768.100	10.055	12.842	3.800	-0.328	38.862	151.590

In addition, the properties of ground-state nuclear matter include: the saturation density $\rho_0 = 0.147$ (fm)⁻³, bulk binding energy/nucleon $(E/A)_\infty = -16.0$ MeV, incompressibility $K = 318.0$ MeV, bulk symmetry energy/nucleon $a_{sym} = 30.68$ MeV, and the effective mass ratio $m^*/m = 0.635$ ^{41,42}.


Inserting the above parameters into Eq.(34) and Eq.(35), we get the relation of ε and P in Dutra et al.(2014) (Type-2), shown as in Fig.8. Here the relation of $c\hbar = 1$ MeV $\times 5.43 \times 10^{-3}$ fm⁻¹ is used. From Fig. 8, it's obvious that P increases with ε in the whole interior of a NS. Inserting EoSs (Eq.(34) and Eq.(35)) into TOV

18 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

 Fig. 8. The relation of ε and P for RMFT in Dutra et al.(2014)(Type-2) .

equation

$$\frac{dP}{dr} = -\frac{G(\varepsilon + P)(m + 4\pi r^2 P)}{r(r - 2Gm)}, \quad \frac{dm}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \varepsilon, \quad (36)$$

gives the one-to-one relation of star mass m and radius r . Since the baryon number density at the stellar center is determined by $n_B(c) = \frac{m}{m_u} / (\frac{4}{3}\pi r^3)$, we obtain the relation of star mass m and $n_B(c)$, as shown in Fig.9. From Fig.9, it's obvious that m increases with the baryon number density at the stellar center $n_B(c)$, and the maximum stellar mass is about $1.9916 M_{Sun}$ (M_{Sun} is the solar mass), corresponding to $n_B(c)=0.9156 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) for RMF theory. The maximum stellar mass of $1.9916 M_{Sun}$ is very close to the observational NS


 Fig. 9. The relation of m and $n_B(c)$ in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2).

mass limit of $\sim 1.97M_{Sun}$ for PSR J1615-2230³⁹, which indicates our parameter-set choice (TMA) is rather reliable and successful.

We also calculate the values of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in the whole density range in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2), as listed in Appendix B. Based on Tables 5-8 in Appendix B, we numerically fit the relations of Y_e vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ and $E_F(e)$ vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ in Dutra et al. (2014) (Type-2), as shown in Fig.10, and obtain a set of analytical expressions of

$$\begin{aligned} Y_e &= -0.000012 + 1.213 \times 10^{-9} e^{\text{Log}_{10}\rho} - 2.51 \times 10^{-15} e^{2\text{Log}_{10}\rho} + 8.19 \times 10^{-21} e^{3\text{Log}_{10}\rho}, \\ Y_e &= 0.0644 - 1.506 \times 10^{-7} e^{\text{Log}_{10}\rho} + 1.11 \times 10^{-13} e^{2\text{Log}_{10}\rho} + 1.84 \times 10^{-20} e^{3\text{Log}_{10}\rho}, \\ Y_e &= -0.188 + 1.85 \times 10^{-7} e^{\text{Log}_{10}\rho} - 3.59 \times 10^{-14} e^{2\text{Log}_{10}\rho} + 2.54 \times 10^{-21} e^{3\text{Log}_{10}\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

for $\rho \sim 6.92 \times 10^{11} - 6.07 \times 10^{13}$, $6.07 \times 10^{13} - 6.9 \times 10^{14}$, and $6.9 \times 10^{14} - 2.56 \times 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, respectively.

Combining Eq.(37) with the special solution of Eq.(14), we plot the diagram of $E_F(e)$ vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ (see the solid-line of Fig.10(b)), and compare our results with those in Dutra et al.(2014)(Type-2)(see the dotted-line of Fig.10(b)). As shown in Fig.10(b), the fitted values of electron Fermi energies are well in agreement with their calculated values, which indicates that the pairs of $E_F(e)$ and Y_e in Tables 5-8 in Appendix B are suited for the special solution of Eq.(14). In other words, the special solution of Eq.(14) is equally applicable to RMF models.

We have found that both Y_e and $E_F(e)$ increase with matter density in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2). Here, the maximum of central density is arbitrarily selected to be $\rho = 1.4 \text{ fm}^{-3}$, corresponding to $Y_e = 0.15570$ and $E_F(e) = 367.40 \text{ MeV}$. Like in classical models, the increase in $E_F(e)$ in RMF theory is also caused by an increase in electron number density in the core of a NS.




Fig. 10. Numerically fitting Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2). Left, the relation of Y_e and ρ . Right, the relation of $E_F(e)$ and ρ . The range of ρ is $(6.92 \times 10^{11} \sim 2.56 \times 10^{15}) \text{ g cm}^{-3}$.

Due to the restriction of space, the other six types in Dutra et al (2014) will no longer be considered.

20 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

6. Comparisons and Discussions

6.1. Relations of Y_e and ρ in different models.

The numerical simulations above indicate that the relation of Y_e and ρ is model dependent. In order to see the differences between relations of Y_e and ρ in several simple classical models (in this work) with those in RMF theory, we produce the diagrams of Y_e vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ in the interior of a NS, as shown in Fig.11. In Fig.11 the black solid-line is obtained by fitting in Sec.4, and the red solid-line is fitted from data of Tables 5-8 in Appendix B in this work. for Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2). By comparing, some classical models (e.g., BPS and BBP models) may be superior to RMF theory model in the low-density crustal region. For example, Y_e in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) begins to appear at $\rho = 6.92 \times 10^{11} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, and always increases with ρ in the high-density range. However, employing the TMA parameter set, Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) will be more excellent than the simple ideal $nep\mu$ and $nep\mu$ models when describing the relation of Y_e and ρ from EoSs, because nucleon-nucleon interaction potentials are replaced by meson fields in RMF theory, rather than be ignored. It is interesting that Y_e in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) grows with ρ more quickly than in ideal npe and $npe\mu$ systems.

In order to make a further comparison, in Fig. 11 we add one blue dot-line fitted from Shen 2002³⁶. In Shen (2002), the author constructed the EoS in a wide NS density range using RMF theory. At low densities, the Thomas-Fermi approximation was used to describe the nonuniform matter composed of a lattice of heavy nuclei; while at high densities, the *TM1* parameter set was adopted. Thus, Y_e in Shen (2002) firstly increases with ρ , then decreases with ρ . However, since the inclusion of hyperons softens the EoS considerably at high densities, the maximum of the stellar mass in Shen (2002) is about $1.6 M_{Sun}$, (due to the depression of hyperons on Fermions), which deviates from the observational NS mass limit of $\sim 1.97 M_{Sun}$ for PSR J1615-2230³⁹.


From the comparisons above, the differences of relations of Y_e and ρ between different models are obvious. Despite these differences, we believe the simulations and comparisons presented in this work will be useful in studying $E_F(e)$ and Y_e of a NS in the future.

6.2. Relation of $E_F(e)$ and n_e


Though both $E_F(e)$ and Y_e are definite functions of ρ . the value of $E_F(e)$ is ultimately determined by only parameter n_e ,

$$\begin{aligned} E_F(e) &= m_e c^2 (1 + x_e^2)^{1/2} \approx m_e c^2 x_e = m_e c^2 (n_e 3\pi^2 \lambda_e^3)^{1/3} \\ &= \hbar c \left(\frac{3}{8\pi} n_e \right)^{1/3} = \hbar c (3\pi^2 n_e)^{1/3} = 6.12 \times 10^{-11} n_e^{1/3} \text{ (MeV)}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $\hbar = h/2\pi$ is the reduced Planks constant. Be note that this equation does not depend on one certain matter model, i.e., Eq.(38) is also a general expression. Based


 Fig. 11. Y_e vs. $\text{Log}_{10}\rho$ in the interior of a NS .

on Eq.(38), we plot a schematic diagram of $E_F(e)$ vs. n_e for relativistic electrons in the whole interior of a common NS.


 Fig. 12. The relation of $E_F(e)$ and n_e for relativistic electrons in a common NS.

From Fig. 12, it is easy to see that, the larger the electron number density, the bigger the electron Fermi energy become. In Fig.12, the dotted line is fitted from data of Tables 5-7 in Dutra et al. (2014) (Type-2), while the solid line is obtained from Eq.(38). These two lines are well in agreement with each other which indicates that our calculations of Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) and the model self are surely correct.

Other Fermi parameters for electrons are also solely determined by n_e . For ex-

22 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*

ample, the electron Fermi velocity, $v_F(e) = \hbar k_F / m_e = \hbar(3\pi^2 n_e)^{1/3} / m_e$, the electron Fermi momentum, $p_F(e) = \hbar k_F = \hbar(3\pi^2 n_e)^{1/3}$, and the Fermi kinetic energy of relativistic electrons, $E_K^F(e) \approx c p_F(e) = c \hbar(3\pi^2 n_e)^{1/3}$, due to $E_K^F(e) \gg m_e c^2$, where $k_F = (3\pi^2 n_e)^{1/3}$ is the electron Fermi wave-vector. However, the relations of n_e and ρ in different density regions of a NS are usually unknown, and the known relations of n_e and ρ depend on EoS in some specific matter models. Our study on $E_F(e)$ may provide some conveniences in investigating EoS of a NS.

6.3. Relations of $E_F(e)$, Y_e and B

In our previous studies, by introducing the Dirac δ -function in superhigh magnetic fields ($B^* = B/B_{\text{cr}} \gg 1$, $B_{\text{cr}} = 4.414 \times 10^{13}$ G is the electron critical field), we investigated the effects of strong magnetic fields on EoS and braking of magnetars^{44,45}.

Since superhigh magnetic fields can cause an increase in Y_e by modifying the electron phase space, the electron number density will increase with magnetic field strength B . From Table 1 of Gao et al.(2013)¹³, we obtain the diagrams of Y_e vs. ρ in BPS model in different magnetic fields, shown as in Fig. 13. Then, the Fermi




Fig. 13. The relation of Y_e and ρ in BPS model in different magnetic fields.

energy of electrons will increase with B . Very recently⁴⁶, by introducing Landau level stability coefficient, we obtain the relations of $E_F(e)$, Y_e , ρ (or n_e) and B ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_F(e) &= 67.6 \times \left(\frac{Y_e}{0.005647} \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{B}{B_{\text{cr}}} \right)^{1/6} \text{ MeV} \\
 &= 6.86 \times 10^{-11} (n_e')^{1/3} = 6.86 \times 10^{-11} \left(\frac{B}{B_{\text{cr}}} \right)^{1/6} (n_e)^{1/3} \text{ MeV}, \quad (39)
 \end{aligned}$$

where n_e' is the number density of electrons in superhigh magnetic fields. Numeri-

cally fitting the relations between $E_F(e)$, Y_e and ρ in superhigh magnetic fields will be considered in our future work.

7. Conclusions

In this paper we deduced a special solution to Fermi energy of relativistic electrons in a common NS. By numerically simulating, we obtained several analytical formulae for Y_e vs. ρ within classical matter models and Dutra et al.(2014)(Type-2).

As a representative model, BBP model is selected to test the validity of the specific solution to $E_F(e)$. By comparing, our method of calculating $E_F(e)$ is more simple and convenient than that in BBP model, as well as those in other matter models.

Using the special solution to $E_F(e)$, we can quickly and accurately calculate the value of Fermi energy for relativistic electrons in any given matter density. The special solution can be universally suitable for relativistic electrons regions in the circumstances of common NSs.

By numerically simulating, the special solution to $E_F(e)$ has been proved to be not only suitable for simple classical matter models, but also for and RMF theory models), though Dutra et al.(2014)(Type-2) was only selected as a presented theory work. Also, the special solution to $E_F(e)$, as well as Eq.(38), could be very useful in indirectly testing whether one EoS of a NS is correct, because Eq.(38) is the source of the special solution of Eq.(14).

As an important parameter in EoS of a NS, the electron Fermi energy is surely of very interest. The special solution to $E_F(e)$ introduced by this work will be very useful in the future study on EoS of NSmatter under extreme conditions, though our methods of treating EoS when numerically fitting are indeed simple.

Acknowledgments

We sincerely thank the anonymous referee for carefully reading the manuscript and providing valuable comments that improved this paper substantially. This work is supported by Xinjiang Natural Science Foundation No.2013211A053.

References

1. R.X. Xu, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **570** (2002) 65.
2. Y.J. Du, et al., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **399**(2009) 1587.
3. X.Y. Lai, C.Y. Gao and R.X. Xu, 2013,*Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **431** (2013) 3290.
4. D.G. Yakovlev, A.D. Kaminker, O.Y. Gnedin and et al. *Phys. Rep.* **354**(2001) 1.
5. Z.F. Gao, N. Wang, J.P. Yuan and et al., *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **333**(2011a) 427.
6. Z.F. Gao, Q.H. Peng, N. Wang and et al., *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **336** (2011b) 427.
7. Z.F. Gao, Q.H. Peng, N. Wang and et al., *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **342**(2012a) 55.
8. K. Wang, Z.Q. Luo and Y.L. Li, *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **29**(2012) 049701 .
9. J.J. Liu, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **347** (2013), 117.
10. S. L. Shapiro and S. A. Teukolsky, *Black Holes, White Drarfs, and Neutron Stars*, (New York, Wiley-Interscience, 1983).

24 Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang

11. J.M. Lattimer and M.Prakash, *Science*, **304**(2004) 536.
12. Z.F. Gao, Q.H. Peng, N. Wang and et al., *Chin. Phys. B* **21**(2012b) 057109.
13. Z.F. Gao, N. Wang, Q.H. Peng and et al., *Mod. Phys. Lett. A*. **28**(36) (2013) 1350138.
14. Z.F. Gao, N. Wang, D.L. Song and et al., *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **334** (2011c) 281.
15. M. Dutra, O. Lourenco, S.S. Avancini and et al., *Phys. Rev. C*. **90** (2014), 055203.
16. C. J. Horowitz, et al., *Phys. Rev. C*. **69** (2004), 045804.
17. B. J. Owen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** (2005) 21101.
18. A. W. Steiner, M. Prakash, J.M. Lattimer and et al., *Phys. Rep.* **410** (2005) 325.
19. A. Burrows, S. Reddy and T. A. Thompson, *Nucl. Phys. A*. **777** (2006) 356.
20. G. Baym, C. Pethick and P. Sutherland, *Astrophys. J.* **170**(1971) 299.
21. S.B. Ruster, M. Hempel and J. Schaffnet-Bielich, *Phys.Rev. C*. **73**, 035804 (2006).
22. S. Tsuruta, J. Sadino, A. akatsuka and et al., *Astrophys. J.* **691** (2009) 621.
23. G. Baym, H.A. Bethe and C.J. Pethick, *Nuclear Phys. A*. **175** (1971) 225.
24. V. Canuto, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **12** (1974) 167.
25. E.E. Salpeter, *Astrophys. J.* **134** (1961) 669.
26. J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash, *Astrophys. J.* **550**, 426 (2001).
27. J. M. Lattimer and M. Prakash, *Phys. Rep.*, **442**, 109 (2007).
28. L.W. Negele and D. Vautherin, *Nucl. Phys. A*. **207** (1973), 298 .
29. D. Atta and D.N. Basu, *Phys. Rev. C*. **90**, 035802 (2014).
30. J.M. Lattimer, M. Prakash, C.J. Pethick and et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991), L2701.
31. P. Haensel, A.Y. Potekhin and D.G. Yakovlev, *Neutron Stars I, Equation of State and Structure*, (New York, Springer, 2007).
32. Y. Xu, G.Z. Liu, H.Y. Wang and et al., *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **29**(2013a) 059701.
33. Y. Xu, G.Z. Liu, C.Z. Liu and et al., *Chin. Phys. Lett.* **30** (2013b) 129501.
34. N. K. Glendenning, *Astrophys. J.* **293** (1985) 470
35. J. Schaffner, C. B. Dover, A. Gal and et al., *Phys Lett B*. **71** (1993) 1328.
36. H. Shen *Phys. Rev. C*. **65** (2002), 035802.
37. F. Yang, H. Shen, *Phys. Rev. C*. **77** (2008), 025801.
38. M. Dutra *Phys. Rev. C*. **85** (2012), 035201.
39. P. B. Demorest, et al. *Nature (London)* **467** (2010) 1081.
40. Y. Sugahara and H. Toki, *Nucl. Phys. A*. **579** (1994), 557.
41. L. Geng, et al. *Progress of Theoretic Physics* **113** (2005), 785.
42. D. Singh, et al. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E*. **21** (2012), 1250076.
43. J. Lattimer and Y. Lim, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **771** (2013), 51.
44. Z.F. Gao, X.J. Zhao, D.L. Song and et al., *Astron. Nachr.* **335**, No.6/7 (2014) 653.
45. Z.F. Gao, X.-D. Li, N. Wang, et al. *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **456** (2016), 55
46. Z.F. Gao, N. Wang, Y. Xu, et al., *Astron. Nachr.* **336**, No.8/9 (2015) 866.
47. H.A. Bethe, G. Borner and K. Sato, *Astron. & Astrophys.* **7**(1970) 279 .
48. J.R. Buchler and Z. Barkat, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **7**(1971) L179 .
49. Z. Barkat, J. R. Buchler and J. C. Wheeler, *Astrophys. J.* **173** (1972) 183.
50. D.G. Ravenhall, C.D. Bennett and C.J. Pethick, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **28** (1972) L978.

Appendix A. Other classical matter models for the crust of a NS

Since BPS model was developed on the basis of the semi-empirical mass formula, it's necessary to introduce the work of Bethe, Borner & Sato (1970)⁴⁷(hereinafter BBS model) that is a typical semi-empirical-mass-formular model. In BBS model, the

energy per nucleon E is given by

$$E = -c_1 A + c_2 Z^2 A^{-\frac{1}{3}} + c_3 \frac{(N - Z)^2}{A} + c_4 A^{\frac{2}{3}}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where N is the neutron number, Z is the proton number, and $A = N + Z$ is the nucleon number. The first term, the second term, the third term and the fourth term on the right-hand side of Eq.(A1) denote the volume energy, Coulomb energy, symmetry energy and surface energy, respectively; the energy constants $c_1=16$ MeV, $c_2=0.72$ MeV, $c_3=24$ MeV, and $c_4=18$ MeV. The above equation fits the experimental data very well for $A \sim 4$ to 260 after correcting for shell effects and for Wigner term⁴⁷. After ignoring the small neutron-proton mass difference, the electron chemical potential μ_e (i.e., the electron Fermi energy) becomes

$$\mu_e = \mu_n - \mu_p = \frac{\partial E}{\partial N} - \frac{\partial E}{\partial Z}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

From Eq.(15) in BBS model⁴⁷, we get the relation of A and x ,

$$A = \frac{c_4}{2c_2} x^{-2} = 12.5 x^{-2}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $x = Z/A$. Thus, Y_e is simply expressed as a function of A

$$Y_e \approx Z/A = \left(\frac{12.5}{A}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Based on Eq.(A4) and Table 2 in Section 4.1, we plot a schematic diagram of Y_e vs. A for relativistic electrons in BBS model and BPS model, as shown in Fig.9(a). Combining Eq.(A4) with Table 1 in BBS model⁴⁷, we plot a schematic diagram of $E_F(e)$ and ρ in BBS model, as shown in Fig.9(b). In this figure we add the fitting curve of $E_F(e)$ vs. $\text{Log}_{10}(\rho)$ from BPS model²⁰.




Fig. 14. Comparisons of BBS model and BPS model in weak field limit. Left, the relations of Y_e and A in BBS and BPS models. Right, the relations of $E_F(e)$ and ρ in BBS and BPS models.

From Fig. 9, in BBS model the electron fraction Y_e is solely determined by nucleon number A , i.e., Y_e monotonously decreases with A ; whereas in BPS model

Y_e is determined by equilibrium nuclei and composition from EoS. The difference of $E_F(e)$ between these two models increases with matter density. Since the semi-empirical mass formula will not fit the experimental data when $\rho > \rho_d$, we stop comparing these two models at the higher densities above $4.3 \times 10^{13} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. In addition, in BBS model the neutron drip density $\rho_d = 2.8 \times 10^{11} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, and the nuclei will disappear suddenly when $\rho = 4.34 \times 10^{13} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$. Due to the introduction of lattice energy, BPS model is superior to all the semi-empirical mass-formula models including BBS model.

Considering the limit of the semi-empirical mass formula, Buchler & Barkat (1971)⁴⁸ (hereinafter BB model) and Barkat, Buchler & Wheeler (1972)⁴⁹ (hereinafter BBW model) calculated the nuclear composition and EOS, and gave the relation of Z and A and the expression of the surface energy by using Thomas-Fermi method. However, both of these models cannot give definite values of A and Z for stable nuclei, and the differences of surface-energy form between BB, BBW and BBP models are very large. Employing Hartree-Fock and Thomas-Fermi methods, Revenhall, Bennett & Pethick (1972)⁵⁰ (hereinafter RBP model) modified the surface energy, calculated EoS, and gave the relation of Z and ρ . However, the expression of Z and ρ in RBW model is similar to that of BB model, but is different from that of BBP model.

Appendix B. Partial calculations in Dura model(Type-2)

Table 5. Partial calculations of n_B , n_e , Y_e , $E_F(e)$, M , ε and P in Dutra et al. 2014 (Type-2).

n_B fm ⁻³	n_e cm ⁻³	Y_e	$E_F(e)$ MeV	M $M_\odot$	ε Mev/fm ³	P Mev/fm ³
---	---	---	---	---	---	---
1.4×10^{-8}	0	0	9.557×10^{-4}	6.7628×10^{-5}	7.167×10^{-8}	3.301×10^{-14}
4.2×10^{-8}	0	0	9.557×10^{-4}	6.7628×10^{-5}	7.167×10^{-8}	3.301×10^{-14}
9.8×10^{-8}	0	0	0.00425	0.0084	4.673×10^{-7}	8.278×10^{-13}
1.12×10^{-7}	0	0	0.00425	0.0084	4.673×10^{-7}	8.278×10^{-13}
5.88×10^{-7}	0	0	0.01392	0.00301	2.731×10^{-6}	1.547×10^{-11}
7.84×10^{-7}	0	0	0.0157	0.00276	3.264×10^{-6}	2.078×10^{-11}
6.72×10^{-6}	0	0	0.07279	0.0035	3.171×10^{-5}	8.820×10^{-10}
9.856×10^{-6}	0	0	0.09457	0.00413	4.663×10^{-5}	1.659×10^{-9}
1.312×10^{-5}	0	0	0.11482	0.00467	6.202×10^{-5}	2.644×10^{-9}
3.78×10^{-4}	5.2842×10^{30}	1.398×10^{-5}	1.1797	0.02355	0.0018	5.736×10^{-7}
6.86×10^{-4}	2.268×10^{31}	3.306×10^{-5}	1.802	0.02577	0.00327	1.4144×10^{-6}
8.96×10^{-4}	4.198×10^{31}	4.685×10^{-5}	2.1823	0.02700	0.00427	2.104×10^{-6}
0.00106	6.202×10^{31}	5.828×10^{-5}	2.4698	0.02783	0.0050	2.708×10^{-6}
0.00112	6.964×10^{31}	6.218×10^{-5}	2.563	0.02808	0.00533	2.918×10^{-6}
0.00123	8.632×10^{31}	7.007×10^{-5}	2.7459	0.02855	0.00587	3.350×10^{-6}
0.00134	1.050×10^{32}	7.810×10^{-5}	2.924	0.02898	0.0064	3.797×10^{-6}
0.007	4.331×10^{33}	6.187×10^{-4}	9.9637	0.06514	0.03339	3.121×10^{-5}
0.0112	1.286×10^{34}	0.00115	14.310	0.06183	0.05344	4.785×10^{-5}
0.0211	5.6976×10^{34}	0.00271	23.496	0.05927	0.10025	6.7902×10^{-5}
0.0322	1.6088×10^{35}	0.005	33.206	0.05781	0.15377	9.6231×10^{-5}
0.0434	3.3639×10^{35}	0.00775	42.459	0.04904	0.2073	2.0973×10^{-4}
0.0546	5.9700×10^{35}	0.01093	51.405	0.02952	0.26088	5.0427×10^{-4}
0.0602	7.6294×10^{35}	0.01267	55.784	0.02714	0.2877	7.4956×10^{-4}
0.0714	1.1725×10^{36}	0.01642	64.374	0.04007	0.34142	0.00149
0.0772	1.4183×10^{36}	0.01842	68.589	0.05169	0.36833	0.00201
0.0882	1.9963×10^{36}	0.02263	76.868	0.08275	0.42229	0.00338
0.0994	2.6942×10^{36}	0.0271	84.946	0.12331	0.47645	0.00526
0.1051	3.0893×10^{36}	0.02942	88.91	0.14684	0.50362	0.00639
0.1106	3.5155×10^{36}	0.03179	92.825	0.17234	0.53086	0.00767
0.1218	4.4622×10^{36}	0.03664	100.50	0.22862	0.58554	0.01068
0.1332	5.5221×10^{36}	0.04152	107.90	0.2904	0.64052	0.01427
0.1386	6.0665×10^{36}	0.04377	111.34	0.32211	0.66813	0.01624
0.1442	6.6243×10^{36}	0.04594	114.65	0.35433	0.69582	0.01835
0.1498	7.1972×10^{36}	0.04805	117.87	0.38701	0.7236	0.0206
0.1554	7.7857×10^{36}	0.0501	120.99	0.42008	0.75146	0.02299
0.1611	8.3895×10^{36}	0.05211	124.04	0.45344	0.77941	0.02553
0.1666	9.0084×10^{36}	0.05407	127.02	0.48699	0.80746	0.02822
0.1722	9.6420×10^{36}	0.05599	129.93	0.52067	0.83559	0.03105
0.1778	1.0291×10^{37}	0.05787	132.78	0.5544	0.86382	0.03404
0.1834	1.0951×10^{37}	0.05971	135.57	0.58809	0.89215	0.03718
0.1891	1.1626×10^{37}	0.06152	138.30	0.62169	0.92058	0.04047
0.1946	1.2314×10^{37}	0.06328	140.97	0.65515	0.9491	0.04392
0.2002	1.3014×10^{37}	0.06501	143.59	0.68839	0.9777	0.04752
0.2058	1.3725×10^{37}	0.06669	146.16	0.72135	1.0065	0.05127
0.2114	1.4448×10^{37}	0.06834	148.68	0.75401	1.0353	0.05518
0.2171	1.5181×10^{37}	0.06996	151.16	0.78632	1.0642	0.05925
0.2226	1.5925×10^{37}	0.07154	153.59	0.81824	1.0933	0.06347
0.2282	1.6678×10^{37}	0.07309	155.97	0.84976	1.1224	0.06785
0.2338	1.7441×10^{37}	0.07461	158.31	0.88083	1.1517	0.07238
0.2492	1.9583×10^{37}	0.07858	164.55	0.96377	1.2328	0.08565
0.2548	2.0377×10^{37}	0.07997	166.74	0.99298	1.2624	0.09077
0.2716	2.2802×10^{37}	0.08395	173.11	1.07735	1.3522	0.10706
0.2786	2.3829×10^{37}	0.08553	175.67	1.11105	1.3899	0.11426
0.2884	2.5283×10^{37}	0.08767	179.17	1.15671	1.4431	0.12474
0.2944	2.6121×10^{37}	0.08885	181.13	1.18203	1.4735	0.13094

28 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*Table 6. Partial calculations of n_B , n_e , Y_e , $E_F(e)$, M , ε and P in Dutra et al.2014(Type-2) (Continued).

n_B fm ⁻³	n_e cm ⁻³	Y_e	$E_F(e)$ MeV	M $M_\odot$	ε Mev/fm ³	P Mev/fm ³
0.3206	3.0169×10^{37}	0.09410	190.04	1.29451	1.6201	0.16245
0.3262	3.1034×10^{37}	0.09514	191.84	1.3166	1.6512	0.16952
0.3318	3.1902×10^{37}	0.09615	193.61	1.33813	1.6825	0.17673
0.336	3.2555×10^{37}	0.09689	194.93	1.3539	1.7061	0.18223
0.3402	3.3211×10^{37}	0.09762	196.23	1.3694	1.7297	0.18782
0.3444	3.3868×10^{37}	0.09834	197.51	1.38459	1.7534	0.19349
0.3486	3.4527×10^{37}	0.09905	198.78	1.39947	1.7772	0.19924
0.3556	3.5631×10^{37}	0.1002	200.88	1.42362	1.8171	0.20900
0.3626	3.6736×10^{37}	0.10131	202.94	1.44698	1.857	0.21898
0.3696	3.7847×10^{37}	0.1024	204.96	1.46957	1.8971	0.22919
0.3766	3.8962×10^{37}	0.10346	206.95	1.49138	1.9375	0.23961
0.3836	4.0081×10^{37}	0.10449	208.92	1.51244	1.9781	0.25024
0.3906	4.1202×10^{37}	0.10548	210.85	1.53275	2.0188	0.26108
0.3976	4.2328×10^{37}	0.10646	212.75	1.55238	2.0598	0.27214
0.4046	4.3456×10^{37}	0.10741	214.62	1.57132	2.1009	0.28341
0.4186	4.5721×10^{37}	0.10922	218.29	1.60712	2.1838	0.30653
0.4256	4.6857×10^{37}	0.11011	220.08	1.62408	2.2256	0.3184
0.4326	4.7996×10^{37}	0.11095	221.85	1.6404	2.2675	0.33046
0.4396	4.9138×10^{37}	0.11178	223.61	1.65612	2.3096	0.34271
0.4466	5.0281×10^{37}	0.11259	225.32	1.67127	2.3521	0.35516
0.4536	5.1427×10^{37}	0.11337	227.02	1.68583	2.3945	0.36779
0.4606	5.2574×10^{37}	0.11414	228.69	1.69986	2.4372	0.38061
0.4676	5.3724×10^{37}	0.11489	230.35	1.71337	2.4802	0.39361
0.4746	5.4875×10^{37}	0.11562	231.98	1.72634	2.523	0.40679
0.4886	5.7183×10^{37}	0.11703	235.19	1.7508	2.6101	0.43368
0.4956	5.8339×10^{37}	0.11771	236.76	1.76233	2.6538	0.44738
0.5026	5.9497×10^{37}	0.11838	238.32	1.7734	2.6977	0.46126
0.5166	6.1818×10^{37}	0.11966	241.38	1.79427	2.7861	0.4895
0.5236	6.2981×10^{37}	0.12028	242.88	1.80409	2.8306	0.50387
0.5446	6.6477×10^{37}	0.12207	247.31	1.83121	2.9652	0.54791
0.5586	6.8815×10^{37}	0.12319	250.16	1.84751	3.0559	0.57803
0.5656	6.9985×10^{37}	0.12374	251.57	1.85514	3.1015	0.59332
0.5796	7.2331×10^{37}	0.12479	254.35	1.86949	3.1933	0.62432
0.5852	7.327×10^{37}	0.12521	255.45	1.87489	3.2303	0.63688
0.5964	7.5152×10^{37}	0.12601	257.62	1.88514	3.3045	0.66226
0.6076	7.7037×10^{37}	0.12679	259.75	1.8947	3.3793	0.68800
0.6216	7.9397×10^{37}	0.12773	262.38	1.90571	3.4734	0.72064
0.6286	8.0579×10^{37}	0.12819	263.67	1.91086	3.5207	0.73716
0.6356	8.1762×10^{37}	0.12864	264.96	1.91578	3.5682	0.7538
0.6636	8.6507×10^{37}	0.13036	269.99	1.93329	3.7610	0.8216
0.6776	8.8887×10^{37}	0.13118	272.44	1.94087	3.8571	0.85621
0.6846	9.0078×10^{37}	0.13158	273.65	1.94439	3.9058	0.87369
0.6916	9.1271×10^{37}	0.13197	274.86	1.94772	3.9548	0.89129
0.6972	9.2226×10^{37}	0.13228	275.81	1.95028	3.9941	0.90544
0.7028	9.3182×10^{37}	0.13259	276.76	1.95272	4.0335	0.91967
0.7084	9.4139×10^{37}	0.13289	277.71	1.95507	4.073	0.93397
0.7196	9.6054×10^{37}	0.13348	279.58	1.95947	4.1524	0.96277
0.7266	9.7253×10^{37}	0.13385	280.73	1.96203	4.2023	0.9809
0.7406	9.9654×10^{37}	0.13456	283.03	1.96675	4.3025	1.0175
0.7476	1.0086×10^{38}	0.13491	284.16	1.96891	4.3529	1.0359
0.7616	1.0326×10^{38}	0.13559	286.40	1.97286	4.4541	1.0731
0.7686	1.0447×10^{38}	0.13592	287.51	1.97467	4.505	1.0919
0.7756	1.0568×10^{38}	0.13625	288.62	1.97634	4.5561	1.1107
0.7826	1.0689×10^{38}	0.13658	289.71	1.97793	4.6073	1.1297
0.7896	1.0811×10^{38}	0.1369	290.80	1.97941	4.6587	1.1487

Table 7. Partial calculations of n_B , n_e , Y_e , $E_F(e)$, M , ε and P in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2) (Continued).

n_B fm^{-3}	n_e cm^{-3}	Y_e	$E_F(e)$ MeV	M $M_\odot$	ε Mev/ fm^3	P Mev/ fm^3
0.8148	1.1246×10^{38}	0.13802	294.66	1.98386	4.8451	1.2180
0.8204	1.1343×10^{38}	0.13826	295.51	1.98471	4.8868	1.2335
0.8246	1.1416×10^{38}	0.13844	296.14	1.98530	4.9182	1.2452
0.8316	1.1538×10^{38}	0.13874	297.19	1.98622	4.9706	1.2648
0.8386	1.1660×10^{38}	0.13904	298.23	1.98704	5.0232	1.2845
0.8456	1.1781×10^{38}	0.13933	299.27	1.98780	5.0759	1.3042
0.8526	1.1904×10^{38}	0.13961	300.30	1.98847	5.1288	1.3240
0.8596	1.2026×10^{38}	0.1399	301.32	1.98909	5.1819	1.3440
0.8708	1.2221×10^{38}	0.14035	302.95	1.98991	5.2671	1.3762
0.8764	1.2319×10^{38}	0.14057	303.75	1.99025	5.3099	1.3921
0.8862	1.2491×10^{38}	0.14095	305.16	1.99075	5.3850	1.4204
0.8918	1.2589×10^{38}	0.14117	305.96	1.99099	5.4280	1.4366
0.8974	1.2687×10^{38}	0.14138	306.75	1.99117	5.4712	1.4529
0.9156	1.3007×10^{38}	0.14206	309.31	1.99156	5.6122	1.5062
0.9212	1.3106×10^{38}	0.14227	310.09	1.9916	5.6557	1.5227
0.9268	1.3204×10^{38}	0.14247	310.86	1.99162	5.6994	1.5393
0.9380	1.3402×10^{38}	0.14288	312.40	1.99153	5.7871	1.5725
0.9436	1.3501×10^{38}	0.14308	313.17	1.99144	5.8311	1.5892
0.9492	1.3600×10^{38}	0.14328	313.93	1.99132	5.8752	1.6060
0.9548	1.3699×10^{38}	0.14347	314.69	1.99119	5.9194	1.6228
0.9604	1.3798×10^{38}	0.14367	315.45	1.99101	5.9637	1.6396
0.9660	1.3897×10^{38}	0.14386	316.20	1.99082	6.0080	1.6565
0.9716	1.3996×10^{38}	0.14405	316.96	1.99059	6.0525	1.6734
0.9772	1.4096×10^{38}	0.14424	317.70	1.99033	6.0971	1.6904
0.9856	1.4245×10^{38}	0.14453	318.82	1.98991	6.1641	1.7159
0.9912	1.4344×10^{38}	0.14472	319.56	1.98958	6.2090	1.7330
0.9968	1.4444×10^{38}	0.14490	320.30	1.98925	6.2539	1.7502
1.0024	1.4543×10^{38}	0.14509	321.03	1.98889	6.2989	1.7673
1.0080	1.4643×10^{38}	0.14527	321.77	1.98851	6.3440	1.7846
1.0360	1.5143×10^{38}	0.14617	325.38	1.98628	6.5710	1.8713
1.0416	1.5243×10^{38}	0.14634	326.10	1.98578	6.6167	1.8888
1.0472	1.5343×10^{38}	0.14652	326.81	1.98525	6.6625	1.9063
1.0528	1.5444×10^{38}	0.14669	327.52	1.98470	6.7083	1.9239
1.0640	1.5645×10^{38}	0.14703	328.94	1.98359	6.8003	1.9591
1.0696	1.5745×10^{38}	0.14721	329.64	1.98299	6.8465	1.9768
1.0752	1.5846×10^{38}	0.14737	330.34	1.98239	6.8927	1.9945
1.0808	1.5946×10^{38}	0.14754	331.04	1.98177	6.9391	2.0123
1.0864	1.6047×10^{38}	0.14771	331.74	1.98114	6.9855	2.0301
1.0920	1.6148×10^{38}	0.14787	332.43	1.98049	7.0320	2.0479
1.0976	1.6249×10^{38}	0.14804	333.12	1.97981	7.0786	2.0658
1.1032	1.6350×10^{38}	0.14820	333.81	1.97915	7.1253	2.0837
1.1088	1.6451×10^{38}	0.14837	334.50	1.97845	7.1721	2.1017
1.1228	1.6704×10^{38}	0.14877	336.20	1.97668	7.2895	2.1467
1.1270	1.6780×10^{38}	0.14889	336.71	1.97613	7.3248	2.1603
1.1396	1.7008×10^{38}	0.14924	338.23	1.97444	7.4311	2.2011
1.1438	1.7084×10^{38}	0.14936	338.73	1.97386	7.4666	2.2148
1.1480	1.7160×10^{38}	0.14948	339.23	1.97328	7.5022	2.2285
1.1648	1.7465×10^{38}	0.14994	341.23	1.97091	7.6450	2.2834
1.1704	1.7567×10^{38}	0.15009	341.89	1.97009	7.6928	2.3017
1.1760	1.7669×10^{38}	0.15024	342.55	1.96926	7.7406	2.3202
1.1816	1.7771×10^{38}	0.15040	343.21	1.96843	7.7886	2.3386
1.1872	1.7873×10^{38}	0.15055	343.87	1.96759	7.8366	2.3571
1.1928	1.7975×10^{38}	0.15069	344.52	1.96675	7.8847	2.3756
1.1984	1.8077×10^{38}	0.15084	345.17	1.96589	7.9330	2.3942

30 *Xing Hu Li, Zhi Fu Gao, Xiang Dong Li, Yan Xu, Pei Wang, and Na Wang*Table 8. **Partial calculations of n_B , n_e , Y_e , $E_F(e)$, M , ε and P in Dutra et al. (2014)(Type-2)** (Continued).

n_B fm ⁻³	n_e cm ⁻³	Y_e	$E_F(e)$ MeV	M $M_\odot$	ε Mev/fm ³	P Mev/fm ³
1.2026	1.8154×10^{38}	0.15095	345.66	1.96525	7.9692	2.4081
1.2068	1.8230×10^{38}	0.15106	346.15	1.96460	8.0054	2.4220
1.2110	1.8307×10^{38}	0.15117	346.63	1.96394	8.0418	2.4360
1.2152	1.8384×10^{38}	0.15128	347.11	1.96327	8.0781	2.4501
1.2194	1.8461×10^{38}	0.15139	347.60	1.96261	8.1145	2.4640
1.2236	1.8538×10^{38}	0.15150	348.08	1.96195	8.1510	2.4781
1.2278	1.8614×10^{38}	0.15161	348.56	1.96127	8.1875	2.4921
1.2320	1.8691×10^{38}	0.15172	349.04	1.96061	8.2241	2.5062
1.2362	1.8768×10^{38}	0.15182	349.52	1.95992	8.2607	2.5203
1.2404	1.8845×10^{38}	0.15193	349.99	1.95925	8.2973	2.5344
1.2446	1.8922×10^{38}	0.15204	350.47	1.95855	8.3340	2.5486
1.2488	1.8999×10^{38}	0.15214	350.95	1.95786	8.3708	2.5627
1.2530	1.9077×10^{38}	0.15225	351.42	1.95717	8.4076	2.5769
1.2572	1.9154×10^{38}	0.15235	351.89	1.95648	8.4444	2.5911
1.2614	1.9231×10^{38}	0.15246	352.37	1.95578	8.4813	2.6053
1.2656	1.9308×10^{38}	0.15256	352.84	1.95507	8.5182	2.6195
1.2698	1.9385×10^{38}	0.15266	353.31	1.95437	8.5552	2.6338
1.2740	1.9463×10^{38}	0.15277	353.78	1.95366	8.5922	2.648
1.2782	1.9540×10^{38}	0.15287	354.24	1.95296	8.6293	2.6623
1.2824	1.9617×10^{38}	0.15297	354.71	1.95224	8.6665	2.6766
1.2866	1.9695×10^{38}	0.15308	355.18	1.95153	8.7036	2.6909
1.2908	1.9772×10^{38}	0.15318	355.64	1.95079	8.7408	2.7053
1.2950	1.9850×10^{38}	0.15328	356.11	1.95008	8.7781	2.7196
1.2992	1.9927×10^{38}	0.15338	356.57	1.94935	8.8154	2.7340
1.2782	1.9540×10^{38}	0.15287	354.24	1.95296	8.6293	2.6623
1.2992	1.9927×10^{38}	0.15338	356.57	1.94935	8.8154	2.7340
1.3034	2.0005×10^{38}	0.15348	357.03	1.94862	8.8528	2.7484
1.3076	2.0082×10^{38}	0.15358	357.49	1.94789	8.8902	2.7628
1.3118	2.0160×10^{38}	0.15368	357.95	1.94718	8.9276	2.7772
1.3160	2.0238×10^{38}	0.15378	358.41	1.94644	8.9651	2.7917
1.3202	2.0315×10^{38}	0.15388	358.87	1.94570	9.0027	2.8062
1.3244	2.0393×10^{38}	0.15398	359.33	1.94497	9.0403	2.8206
1.3286	2.0471×10^{38}	0.15408	359.78	1.94423	9.0779	2.8351
1.3328	2.0549×10^{38}	0.15418	360.24	1.94347	9.1156	2.8497
1.3370	2.0627×10^{38}	0.15427	360.69	1.94274	9.1533	2.8642
1.3412	2.0704×10^{38}	0.15437	361.14	1.94200	9.1911	2.8788
1.3454	2.0782×10^{38}	0.15447	361.60	1.94125	9.2289	2.8933
1.3496	2.0860×10^{38}	0.15457	362.05	1.94051	9.2668	2.9079
1.3538	2.0938×10^{38}	0.15466	362.50	1.93976	9.3047	2.9225
1.3580	2.1016×10^{38}	0.15476	362.95	1.93897	9.3427	2.9372
1.3622	2.1094×10^{38}	0.15485	363.40	1.93823	9.3807	2.9518
1.3664	2.1172×10^{38}	0.15495	363.85	1.93749	9.4187	2.9665
1.3706	2.1251×10^{38}	0.15505	364.29	1.93673	9.4568	2.9811
1.3748	2.1329×10^{38}	0.15514	364.74	1.93598	9.4949	2.9958
1.3790	2.1407×10^{38}	0.15523	365.18	1.93523	9.5331	3.0105
1.3832	2.1485×10^{38}	0.15533	365.63	1.93446	9.5713	3.0253
1.3888	2.1589×10^{38}	0.15545	366.22	1.93344	9.6224	3.0449
1.3944	2.1694×10^{38}	0.15558	366.81	1.93242	9.6735	3.0646
1.40	2.1798×10^{38}	0.15570	367.40	1.9314	9.7247	3.0844